

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS
WEST PLAINS MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS WEST PLAINS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FINAL EIS

ES.1 – INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to assess the environmental effects of issuing a two-part determination under Section 20 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) (Proposed Action), and the subsequent development of the West Plains Casino and Mixed-Use Development by the Spokane Tribe of Indians (Tribe). Under Section 20 of IGRA (25 USC § 2719) gaming on lands acquired in trust by the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) after October 17, 1988 is prohibited, with some exceptions. In this case, gaming on the 145-acre property adjacent to the City of Airway Heights (City) would require that the Secretary make a “two-part determination,” under Section 20(b)(1)(A) that gaming on the property currently held in federal trust on behalf of the Tribe would be (1) in the best interest of the Tribe and (2) not detrimental to the surrounding community (25 U.S.C. § 2719(b)(1)(A)). A Secretarial two-part determination may only be made after consultation with the Tribe and appropriate state and local officials, including officials of other nearby tribes. In addition, Washington’s Governor must concur with the determination before gaming could occur on the property. Compliance with NEPA is also required for approval of the Tribe’s gaming development and management contract by the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC), a federal agency, before such contract can go into effect.

For the purpose of this EIS, the BIA serves as the Lead Agency for compliance with NEPA, with the NIGC, Tribe, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), the City, Spokane County, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and U.S. Department of the Air Force (Air Force) serving as Cooperating Agencies.

ES.2 – PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose for the Proposed Action is to advance the BIA’s “Self Determination” policy of promoting the Tribe’s self-governance capability, and to promote opportunities for economic development and self-sufficiency of the Tribe and its members. The Tribe’s need for the Proposed Action is based on:

- Lack of a sufficient and sustained income source, which hinders the Tribe’s ability to maintain programs and services necessary to improve the overall condition of the tribal membership;
- Desire to become a completely self-sufficient entity and eliminate reliance on grant funds (soft money);
- Lack of employment opportunities for tribal members (approximately 47 percent are unemployed, and 43 percent of the employed are below the federal poverty level);
- Desire to further develop the Tribe’s property adjacent to the City with tribal economic enterprises;
- Potential profitability of Class III gaming in Airway Heights;

- Desire to re-establish cash reserves to ensure the stability of the Tribe through tough economic times in the future.
- Desire to improve services and quality of life for tribal members and their families
- Desire to contribute towards improving local communities through job creation and economic opportunities.

ES.3 – SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

The Proposed Action analyzed in this EIS is the issuance of a two-part determination under Section 20 of the IGRA for Class III gaming on 145 acres held in federal trust for the Tribe in the City of Airway Heights, Washington. The foreseeable consequence of this action would be the development of a casino-resort facility with associated support facilities on the property. The alternatives addressed in this EIS, including the No Action/No Development Alternative, are summarized below. The potential adverse environmental effects and applicable mitigation measures relevant to each alternative are presented in **Table ES-1**.

ALTERNATIVE 1 – PROPOSED CASINO AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

Alternative 1 consists of the phased construction of a casino-resort facility, parking facilities, 155,145 square feet of retail space, a 10,480-square-foot tribal cultural center, 14,036-square-foot tribal police and fire station, and a 41,633-square-foot two-story commercial building to be constructed on the approximately 145-acre site located in the western area of the City. Under Alternative 1, the gaming component of the facility would consist of approximately 2,500 electronic gaming devices (EGDs), 50 table games, and 10 poker room tables within a 98,442-square-foot gaming floor area. Other facilities within the casino-resort facility include a 300-room hotel, a cafe, a steakhouse, three restaurants, a food court, bars, a convention/banquet area, 96,634 square feet of lifestyle retail located on the southwest side of the casino-resort facility, and a 107,490-square-foot specialty retail box store with direct access to the casino floor. The 300-room hotel would include a fully enclosed 71,719-square-foot indoor swimming pool area, a spa/wellness center, and a fitness center. The hotel tower would not exceed 145 feet above ground level. A four-story concrete parking structure would be located on the west side of the casino-resort facility and would include 1,500 parking spaces. A total of 4,753 surface parking spaces would be provided for Alternative 1.

ALTERNATIVE 2 – REDUCED CASINO AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

Alternative 2 consists of the construction of a casino-resort facility, parking facilities, 155,145 square feet of retail space, a 10,480-square-foot tribal cultural center, 14,036-square-foot tribal police and fire station, and a 41,633-square-foot two-story commercial building to be constructed on the approximately 145-acre site. Under Alternative 2, the gaming component of the facility would consist of approximately 1,500 EGDs, 32 table games, and 10 poker room tables within a 61,000 square-foot gaming floor area. Other facilities within the casino-resort facility include a cafe, a steakhouse, a food court, bars, and a 12,600 square-foot multi-purpose bingo room. No hotel or parking structure is proposed under Alternative 2. A total of 4,624 surface parking spaces would be provided for Alternative 2.

ALTERNATIVE 3 – NON-GAMING MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT

Under Alternative 3, the overall building program would be similar in size to that of Alternative 1; however, a casino would not be developed. Alternative 3 consists of the construction of a mixed-use development complex, a 300-room hotel, parking facilities, 155,145 square feet of retail space, a 10,480-square-foot tribal cultural center, 14,036-square-foot tribal police and fire station, and a 41,633-square-foot two-story commercial building to be constructed on the approximately 145-acre site. At build-out the entertainment components would consist of a 55,850-square-foot children’s arcade, a 45,202-square-foot bowling alley, and an 8,593-square-foot lounge area. Food facilities within the complex would include a coffee shop, a food court with 10 venues, a steakhouse, 2 specialty restaurants, and a retail restaurant. Other facilities within the complex include a convention/banquet area and a 96,634-square-foot lifestyle retail component located on the southwest side of the complex. As described under Alternative 1, the hotel tower would not exceed 145 feet above ground level and would include a fully enclosed 71,719-square-foot indoor swimming pool area, a spa/wellness center, and a fitness center. A four-story concrete parking structure would be located on the west side of the mixed-use development complex and would include 1,500 parking spaces. A total of 4,753 surface parking spaces would be provided for Alternative 3.

ALTERNATIVE 4 – NO ACTION/NO DEVELOPMENT

Under the No Action/No Development Alternative, none of the three development alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, and 3) considered within this EIS would be implemented. The No Action/No Development Alternative assumes that existing uses on the project site would not change in the near term and that the BIA would not take any actions to promote tribal self-determination and economic development.

ES.4 – AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The BIA published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register* on August 19, 2009 and August 27, 2009¹, describing the Proposed Action, and announcing the BIA’s intent to prepare an EIS (**Appendix B**). The results of the scoping period were made available in a scoping report published by the BIA in March 2011. This report is available for review at <http://www.westplainseis.com/> or upon request to the BIA’s Northwest Region Office at 911 NE 11th Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97232. Issues raised during scoping generally fell into the following categories.

- | | |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| ▪ Procedural/NEPA Process | ▪ Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice |
| ▪ Alternatives and Purpose and Need | ▪ Resources Use Patterns |
| ▪ Land Resources | ▪ Public Services |
| ▪ Water Resources | ▪ Noise |
| ▪ Air Quality | ▪ Indirect Effects |
| ▪ Biological Resources | ▪ Cumulative Effects |
| ▪ Cultural and Paleontological Resources | |

¹ The NOI published on August 19, 2009 contained incorrect dates for the close of the comment period and public scoping meeting. The NOI published on August 27, 2009 republished the content of the original notice with corrected dates.

To the extent required by NEPA, this EIS has incorporated the issues and concerns identified during the scoping process.

ES.5 – SUMMARY MATRIX

The potential adverse and beneficial effects, as well as mitigation measures, relevant to each alternative are presented in **Table ES-1**. For a detailed discussion of environmental consequences and mitigation measures see **Chapters 4.0** and **5.0**.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Geology and Soils				
Topography	Topographic features of the site would be altered by earthwork; however, the project design would preserve the most significant topographic features - LS	Topographic features of the site would be altered by earthwork; however, the project design would preserve the most significant topographic features - LS	Topographic features of the site would be altered by earthwork; however, the project design would preserve the most significant topographic features - LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Soils/Geology	Disturbance of the soils could result in loss of topsoil and a degradation of air quality through wind erosion. - LSM	Disturbance of the soils could result in loss of topsoil and a degradation of air quality through wind erosion. - LSM	Disturbance of the soils could result in loss of topsoil and a degradation of air quality through wind erosion. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	An Erosion Control Plan (ECP) that shall identify the locations of erosion control features recommended to direct and filter stormwater runoff shall be created and implemented prior to start of any site disturbance. A General Construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit shall be obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Federal requirements of the Clean Water Act (CWA). As required by the NPDES permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared that addresses potential water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of	An ECP that shall identify the locations of erosion control features recommended to direct and filter stormwater runoff shall be created and implemented prior to start of any site disturbance. A General Construction NPDES permit shall be obtained from the EPA under the Federal requirements of the CWA. As required by the NPDES permit, a SWPPP shall be prepared that addresses potential water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the project alternatives. Specific BMPs recommended for Alternative 2 are listed in Section 5.2.1 .	An ECP that shall identify the locations of erosion control features recommended to direct and filter stormwater runoff shall be created and implemented prior to start of any site disturbance. A General Construction NPDES permit shall be obtained from the EPA under the Federal requirements of the CWA. As required by the NPDES permit, a SWPPP shall be prepared that addresses potential water quality impacts associated with construction and operation of the project alternatives. Specific BMPs recommended for Alternative 3 are listed in Section 5.2.1 .	

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
	the project alternatives. Specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) recommended for Alternative 1 are listed in Section 5.2.1 .			
Seismicity	The proposed facilities would not be significantly affected by seismic hazards. - NE	The proposed facilities would not be significantly affected by seismic hazards. - NE	The proposed facilities would not be significantly affected by seismic hazards. - NE	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mineral Resources	The development would not adversely affect known or recorded mineral resources. - NE	The development would not adversely affect known or recorded mineral resources. - NE	The development would not adversely affect known or recorded mineral resources. - NE	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Water Resources				
Flooding	The project is not located in a floodplain and thus would not affect floodplain management. - NE	The project is not located in a floodplain and thus would not affect floodplain management. - NE	The project is not located in a floodplain and thus would not affect floodplain management. - NE	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Construction Impacts	Construction of the project could result in discharges of pollutants to surface waters. - LSM	Construction of the project could result in discharges of pollutants to surface waters. - LSM	Construction of the project could result in discharges of pollutants to surface waters. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	Implement mitigation for soils, above.	Implement mitigation for soils, above.	Implement mitigation for soils, above.	NA
Stormwater Runoff	All stormwater run-off would be contained within the project site. No discharge to off-site surface waters would occur; therefore, there would be no impact to drainage facilities. - LS	All stormwater run-off would be contained within the project site. No discharge to off-site surface waters would occur; therefore, there would be no impact to drainage facilities. - LS	All stormwater run-off would be contained within the project site. No discharge to off-site surface waters would occur; therefore, there would be no impact to drainage facilities. - LS	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Groundwater	Detention swales could transport dissolved contaminants into the groundwater through percolation. - LSM	Detention swales could transport dissolved contaminants into the groundwater through percolation. - LSM	Detention swales could transport dissolved contaminants into the groundwater through percolation. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	The Tribe has committed in the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the City to design stormwater facilities in accordance with the Airway Heights Public Works Standards. See Section 5.2.2 for detailed design components.	The Tribe has committed in the IGA with the City to design stormwater facilities in accordance with the Airway Heights Public Works Standards. See Section 5.2.2 for detailed design components.	The Tribe has committed in the IGA with the City to design stormwater facilities in accordance with the Airway Heights Public Works Standards. See Section 5.2.2 for detailed design components.	NA
Air Quality				
Construction Emissions	Construction of Alternative 1 would not cause an exceedance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria air pollutants (CAPs). Emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) could impact sensitive receptors. - LSM	Construction of Alternative 2 would not cause an exceedance of NAAQS for CAPs. Emissions of DPM could impact sensitive receptors. - LSM	Construction of Alternative 3 would not cause an exceedance of NAAQS for CAPs. Emissions of DPM could impact sensitive receptors. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	Specific BMPs to reduce fugitive dust and DPM emissions shall be implemented during construction. Refer to Section 5.2.3 .	Specific BMPs to reduce fugitive dust and DPM emissions shall be implemented during construction. Refer to Section 5.2.3 .	Specific BMPs to reduce fugitive dust and DPM emissions shall be implemented during construction. Refer to Section 5.2.3 .	NA
Operational Vehicle and Area Emissions	Estimated mobile and stationary emissions of CAPs from operation of Alternative 1 would not exceed NAAQS. - LS	Estimated mobile and stationary emissions of CAPs from operation of Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects. - LS	Estimated mobile and stationary emissions of CAPs from operation of Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects. - LS	NE
Mitigation	Control of diesel powered vehicles	Control of diesel powered vehicles	Control of diesel powered vehicles	NA

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
	and other BMPs to reduce mobile source emissions listed in Section 5.2.3 would further reduce less than significant effects.	and other BMPs to reduce mobile source emissions listed in Section 5.2.3 would further reduce less than significant effects.	and other BMPs to reduce mobile source emissions listed in Section 5.2.3 would further reduce less than significant effects.	
Biological Resources				
Habitats	None of the habitats that would be affected by the implementation of Alternative 1 are considered sensitive communities; therefore, no effect would occur. - NE	None of the habitats that would be affected by the implementation of Alternative 2 are considered sensitive communities; therefore, no effect would occur. - NE	None of the habitats that would be affected by the implementation of Alternative 3 are considered sensitive communities; therefore, no effect would occur. - NE	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Federally Listed Species	No federal listed wildlife species occur within the project site; therefore, no effect to federally listed wildlife would occur. Removal of ornamental landscaping associated with Alternative 1 would remove habitat for the potentially occurring Spalding's silene, a federally listed plant species.- LSM	No federal listed wildlife species occur within the project site; therefore, no effect to federally listed wildlife would occur. Removal of ornamental landscaping associated with Alternative 2 would remove habitat for the potentially occurring Spalding's silene, a federally listed plant species.- LSM	No federal listed wildlife species occur within the project site; therefore, no effect to federally listed wildlife would occur. Removal of ornamental landscaping associated with Alternative 3 would remove habitat for the potentially occurring Spalding's silene, a federally listed plant species.- LSM	NE
Mitigation	Conducting an additional focused botanical survey within the blooming season and establishing an avoidance buffer around potential habitat should this species be identified, as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 , would ensure that impacts to Spalding's silene are avoided.	Conducting an additional focused botanical survey within the blooming season and establishing an avoidance buffer around potential habitat should this species be identified, as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 , would ensure that impacts to Spalding's silene are avoided.	Conducting an additional focused botanical survey within the blooming season and establishing an avoidance buffer around potential habitat should this species be identified, as described in detail in Section 5.2.4 , would ensure that impacts to Spalding's silene are avoided.	NA
Migratory Birds	Construction of Alternative 1 could result in impacts to species protected under the Migratory Bird	Construction of Alternative 2 could result in impacts to species protected under the MBTA if active	Construction of Alternative 3 could result in impacts to species protected under the MBTA if active nests are	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	Procedures for post-review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed as described in Section 5.2.5.	Procedures for post-review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed as described in Section 5.2.5.	Procedures for post-review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed as described in Section 5.2.5.	NA
Paleontological Resources	Previously unknown paleontological resources could be discovered during earthmoving activities. - LSM	Previously unknown paleontological resources could be discovered during earthmoving activities. - LSM	Previously unknown paleontological resources could be discovered during earthmoving activities. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	A qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the find and collect the materials for curation, as appropriate.	A qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the find and collect the materials for curation, as appropriate.	A qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the significance of the find and collect the materials for curation, as appropriate.	NA
Socioeconomic Conditions				
Economic Effects	Under Alternative 1, construction activities are estimated to cost approximately \$404.3 million, which is expected to generate a one-time total output of approximately \$301.9 million within the County. New spending from the proposed project is expected to generate a net annual total output of approximately \$249.3 million within the County during the operation phase. Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would generate substantial output to a variety of businesses in Spokane County, which would stimulate the local economy. - BE	Under Alternative 2, construction activities are estimated to cost approximately \$160.0 million, which is expected to generate a one-time total output of approximately \$121.6 million within the County. Alternative 2 is expected to generate an annual total output of approximately \$147.0 million within the County during the operation phase. Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would generate substantial output to a variety of businesses in Spokane County, which would stimulate the local economy. - BE	Under Alternative 3, construction activities are estimated to cost approximately \$256.1 million, which is expected to generate a one-time total output of approximately \$228.7 million within the County. Alternative 3 is expected to generate an annual total output of approximately \$111.6 million within the County. Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would generate substantial output to a variety of businesses in Spokane County, which would stimulate the local economy. - BE	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Substitution Effects	The anticipated gaming revenue substitution effect under Alternative 1 would be approximately 32.7 percent of total projected gaming revenue for the project (\$81.2 million); however, anticipated substitution effects would not result in the closure of any of the competing gaming facilities. Substitution effects resulting from Alternative 1 would not impact the ability of the Kalispell or Coeur D'Alene tribal governments to provide essential services and facilities to its membership. It is not anticipated that significant quantifiable non-gaming substitution effects would occur. - LS	The anticipated gaming revenue substitution effect under Alternative 2 would be approximately 22.5 percent of total projected gaming revenue for the project (\$58.6 million); however, anticipated substitution effects would not result in the closure of any of the competing gaming facilities. Substitution effects resulting from Alternative 2 would not impact the ability of the Kalispell or Coeur D'Alene tribal government to provide essential services and facilities to its membership. It is not anticipated that significant quantifiable non-gaming substitution effects would occur. - LS	Alternative 3 would not result in a measurable impact on existing retail businesses in the project area since the proposed retail square-footage would be less than the estimated retail growth opportunity in the region. The substitution effect resulting from Alternative 3, should it occur, would represent a negligible portion of total economic activity that would be generated by its operation. - LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tax Revenues	Alternative 1 would be constructed on land that is already held in trust by the federal government for the Tribe. Therefore, no property taxes would be lost. Tax revenues would be generated for federal, state and local governments from activities including secondary economic activity generated by tribal gaming. Construction of Alternative 1 would generate one-time \$8.6 million in federal tax revenues, and \$6.6 million in state/county/local tax revenues. Operation of Alternative 1 would generate annually \$6.3 million	Alternative 2 would be constructed on land that is already held in trust by the federal government for the Tribe. Therefore, no property taxes would be lost. Tax revenues would be generated for federal, state and local governments from activities including secondary economic activity generated by tribal gaming. Construction would result in an estimated \$3.4 million in federal tax revenues, and \$2.6 million in state/County/local government tax revenues. Operation of Alternative 2 would result in an estimated \$3.7	Alternative 3 would be constructed on land that is already held in trust by the federal government for the Tribe. Therefore, no property taxes would be lost. Tax revenues would be generated for federal, state and local governments from activities including secondary economic activity generated by tribal gaming. Construction would result in an estimated \$6.3 million in federal tax revenues, and \$4.9 million in state/County/local government tax revenues. Operation of Alternative 3 would result in an estimated \$2.9	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
	Spokane County housing market is projected to have 211,307 total units and 14,185 vacant units. Due to the number of anticipated vacant houses in the vicinity of the project, Alternative 1 is not expected to stimulate regional housing development. - LS	fulfill the demands for housing under Alternative 2. Due to the number of vacant houses in the vicinity of the project, Alternative 2 is not expected to stimulate regional housing development. - LS	fulfill the demands for housing under Alternative 3. Due to the number of vacant houses in the vicinity of the project, Alternative 3 is not expected to stimulate regional housing development. - LS	
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Social Effects	<p>Because four existing casinos are located within 50 miles of the project site, including the existing Northern Quest Casino located approximately two miles from the project site, no increase in problem gambling rates in the local area is anticipated. - LS</p> <p>Alternative 1 would introduce a large number of patrons and employees into the community on a daily basis. As a result, under Alternative 1, criminal incidents would be expected to increase in the project area, particularly at the project site, as with any other development of this size. However, increased tax revenues resulting from Alternative 1 and local agreements between the Tribe, County, and City of Airway Heights would fund expansion of law enforcement services required to accommodate planned growth.</p>	<p>Social impacts including pathological and problem gambling, and crime from Alternative 2 would be comparable but to a lesser extent than Alternative 1, since Alternative 2 is reduced in size and scope. Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with problem gambling or crime. - LS</p>	<p>As no gaming will be developed under Alternative 3, no increase in problem gambling will occur. - LS</p> <p>Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with crime. - LS</p>	<p>NE</p> <p>NA</p>

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with crime. - LS Optional mitigation measures to address problem gambling, including voluntary self-exclusion, are recommended in Section 5.2.6.	Optional mitigation measures to address problem gambling, including voluntary self-exclusion, are recommended in Section 5.2.6.	NA	NA
Community Impacts	Due to the limited number of employees that are expected to relocate to the project area, effects on Spokane County's schools, libraries, and parks are expected to be minimal. - LS	Due to the limited number of employees that are expected to relocate to the project area, effects on Spokane County's schools, libraries, and parks are expected to be minimal. - LS	Due to the limited number of employees that are expected to relocate to the project area, effects on Spokane County's schools, libraries, and parks are expected to be minimal. - LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Effects to the Spokane Indian Tribe	Alternative 1 would generate employment opportunities that are expected to benefit Tribal members as well fund necessary tribal member services. - BE	Alternative 2 would not generate a sufficient amount of revenue to fund all essential governmental, social, and other services for the Tribe. - S	Alternative 3 would not generate a sufficient amount of revenue to fund all essential governmental, social, and other services. - S	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Effects to the Kalispel Indian Tribe	The reduction in gaming revenue at the Northern Quest Casino Resort from economic competition as a result of Alternative 1 would not significantly impact the Kalispel tribal government's budget to the point where it would no longer be able to provide essential services and facilities to its membership. - LS	The reduction in gaming revenue at the Northern Quest Casino Resort from economic competition as a result of Alternative 2 would not significantly impact the Kalispel tribal government's budget to the point where it would no longer be able to provide essential services and facilities to its membership. - LS	The reduction in gaming revenue at the Northern Quest Casino Resort from economic competition as a result of Alternative 3 would not significantly impact the Kalispel tribal government's budget to the point where it would no longer be able to provide essential services and facilities to its membership. - LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Environmental Justice: Minority and Low-income Communities	No low-income or minority communities were identified through review of the demographics of Census tracts in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects to low-income or minority communities. - NE	No low-income or minority communities were identified through review of the demographics of Census tracts in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects to low-income or minority communities. - NE	No low-income or minority communities were identified through review of the demographics of Census tracts in the vicinity of the project site; therefore, Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects to low-income or minority communities. - NE	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Transportation				
Site Access	Access to the site will be provided by six driveways, three along US-2 and three along Craig Road between US-2 and 6 th Avenue. The addition of the driveways to the existing roadway could potentially result in circulation and safety impacts. - LSM	Access to the site will be provided by six driveways, three along US-2 and three along Craig Road between US-2 and 6 th Avenue. The addition of the driveways to the existing roadway could potentially result in circulation and safety impacts. - LSM	Access to the site will be provided by six driveways, three along US-2 and three along Craig Road between US-2 and 6 th Avenue. The addition of the driveways to the existing roadway could potentially result in circulation and safety impacts. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	Improvements to the access intersections to manage safe ingress and egress of traffic at the project site have been recommended as a result of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and Addendums (Appendix D of the Draft EIS and Appendix R of the Final EIS) and are included as mitigation in Section 5.2.7	Improvements to the access intersections to manage safe ingress and egress of traffic at the project site have been recommended as a result of the TIA and Addendums (Appendix D of the Draft EIS and Appendix R of the Final EIS) and are included as mitigation in Section 5.2.7	Improvements to the access intersections to manage safe ingress and egress of traffic at the project site have been recommended as a result of the TIA and Addendums (Appendix D of the Draft EIS and Appendix R of the Final EIS) and are included as mitigation in Section 5.2.7	NA
Construction Traffic	Construction activity impacts would be concentrated on US-2 in the immediate vicinity of the project site, and would include temporary traffic delays due to slower moving	Construction related traffic impacts would be similar to Alternative 1. Because construction traffic would be temporary, significantly less than operational traffic, and would occur	Construction related traffic impacts would be similar to Alternative 1. Because construction traffic would be temporary, significantly less than operational traffic, and would occur	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	<p>construction trucks and the increase in worker vehicles on area roadways. Because construction traffic would be temporary, significantly less than operational traffic, and would occur outside of the peak hour, within mitigation significant adverse effects would not occur. - LSM</p> <p>During construction of Alternative 1, the Tribe will comply with all Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT) requirements for work within federal and state rights-of-way, including the preparation of a traffic management plan as outlined in Section 5.2.7.</p>	<p>outside of the peak hour, with mitigation significant adverse effects would not occur. - LSM</p> <p>During construction of Alternative 2, the Tribe will comply with all WSDOT requirements for work within federal and state rights-of-way, including the preparation of a traffic management plan as outlined in Section 5.2.7.</p>	<p>outside of the peak hour, with mitigation significant adverse effects would not occur. - LSM</p> <p>During construction of Alternative 3, the Tribe will comply with all WSDOT requirements for work within federal and state rights-of-way, including the preparation of a traffic management plan as outlined in Section 5.2.7.</p>	NA
Project Traffic	<p>The increase in traffic generated by buildout of Alternative 1 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations at the study intersections below, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US-2/Craig Road ▪ US-2/Lundstrom Street ▪ US-2/Hayford Road ▪ Craig Road/SR-902 ▪ US-2/Middle Driveway ▪ US-2/Garfield ▪ Deer Heights Road/US-2 ▪ Flint Road/US-2 ▪ Spotted Road/US-2 ▪ Deno Road/Hayford Road <p>- LSM</p>	<p>The increase in traffic generated by Alternative 2 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations at the study intersections below, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US-2/Craig Road ▪ US-2/Lundstrom Street ▪ US-2/Hayford Road ▪ Craig Road/SR-902 ▪ US-2/Middle Driveway ▪ Deer Heights Road/US-2 ▪ Flint Road/US-2 <p>Spotted Road/US-2- LSM</p>	<p>The increase in traffic generated by Alternative 3 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations at the study intersections below, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US-2/Craig Road ▪ US-2/Lundstrom Street ▪ US-2/Middle Driveway ▪ Deer Heights Road/US-2 <p>Flint Road/US-2- LSM</p>	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	The Tribe shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (B, C, D, and E) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 1. Mitigation would restore the intersections identified above to acceptable operating conditions in accordance with applicable agency requirements, or would restore operating conditions to pre-development levels.	The Tribe shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (C) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 2. Mitigation would restore the intersections identified above to acceptable operating conditions in accordance with applicable agency requirements, or would restore operating conditions to pre-development levels.	The Tribe shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (F) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 3. Mitigation would restore the intersections identified above to acceptable operating conditions in accordance with applicable agency requirements, or would restore operating conditions to pre-development levels.	NA
Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities	The addition of project-related riders to existing ridership on Spokane Transit Authority (STA) Route 61 buses would not exceed the capacity of STAs existing facilities. Because sufficient parking is available onsite and sidewalk and bicycle facilities do not provide direct access to the project site, no significant effects would occur to pedestrian facilities as a result of Alternative 1. - LS	The addition of project-related riders to existing ridership on STA Route 61 buses would not exceed the capacity of STAs existing facilities. Because sufficient parking is available onsite and sidewalk and bicycle facilities do not provide direct access to the project site, no significant effects would occur to pedestrian facilities as a result of Alternative 2. - LS	The addition of project-related riders to existing ridership on STA Route 61 buses would not exceed the capacity of STAs existing facilities. Because sufficient parking is available onsite and sidewalk and bicycle facilities do not provide direct access to the project site, no significant effects would occur to pedestrian facilities as a result of Alternative 3. - LS	NE
Mitigation	To further reduce less than significant effects to transit and pedestrian facilities, the Tribe shall work with STA to provide additional public transportation opportunities, and shall install sidewalks and pathways to connect site development to transit stops and public path and bikeways to encourage and facilitate use of	To further reduce less than significant effects to transit and pedestrian facilities, the Tribe shall work with STA to provide additional public transportation opportunities, and shall install sidewalks and pathways to connect site development to transit stops and public path and bikeways to encourage and facilitate use of	To further reduce less than significant effects to transit and pedestrian facilities, the Tribe shall work with STA to provide additional public transportation opportunities, and shall install sidewalks and pathways to connect site development to transit stops and public path and bikeways to encourage and facilitate use of transit and non-motorized travel	NA

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
	transit and non-motorized travel modes in accordance with local bike/pedestrian plans. The Tribe shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to pedestrian and transit facility improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (J) .	transit and non-motorized travel modes in accordance with local bike/pedestrian plans. The Tribe shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to pedestrian and transit facility improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (J) .	modes in accordance with local bike/pedestrian plans. The Tribe shall implement and/or pay a fair share contribution to pedestrian and transit facility improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (J) .	
Land Use				
Existing and Planned Land Uses	Alternative 1 is compatible with nearby existing and planned land uses. Although state and local land use plans do not apply to tribal lands, Alternative 1 would be compatible with local zoning and land use policies as well as policies related to land use in the vicinity of the Fairchild Air Force Base (AFB) and Spokane International Airport (SIA). - LSM	Alternative 2 is compatible with nearby existing and planned land uses. Although state and local land use plans do not apply to tribal lands, Alternative 2 would be compatible with local zoning and land use policies as well as policies related to land use in the vicinity of the Fairchild AFB and SIA. - LSM	Alternative 3 is compatible with nearby existing and planned land uses. Although state and local land use plans do not apply to tribal lands, Alternative 3 would be compatible with local zoning and land use policies as well as policies related to land use in the vicinity of the Fairchild AFB and SIA. – LSM	NE
Mitigation	Mitigation measures to address compatibility issues associated with potential nuisances that may be caused by AFB operations are recommended in Section 5.2.8, 5.2.10, and 5.2.12.	Mitigation measures to address compatibility issues associated with potential nuisances that may be caused by AFB operations are recommended in Section 5.2.8, 5.2.10, and 5.2.12.	Mitigation measures to address compatibility issues associated with potential nuisances that may be caused by AFB operations are recommended in Section 5.2.8, 5.2.10, and 5.2.12.	NA
Agriculture	Because the project site is not used for agricultural purposes and has been set aside for urban development, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects to agricultural resources. – NE	Because the project site is not used for agricultural purposes and has been set aside for urban development, Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects to agricultural resources. - NE	Because the project site is not used for agricultural purposes and has been set aside for urban development, Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects to agricultural resources. - NE	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Public Services				
Water Supply	City of Airway Heights has the supply and pressure capabilities to serve Alternative 1 and has agreed to supply water pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public water system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 1 - LS	City of Airway Heights has the supply and pressure capabilities to serve Alternative 2 and has agreed to supply water pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public water system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 2 - LS	City of Airway Heights has the supply and pressure capabilities to serve Alternative 3 and has agreed to supply water pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public water system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 3 - LS	NE
Mitigation	In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current water capital connection charge and monthly service fees for water service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.	In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current water capital connection charge and monthly service fees for water service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.	In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current water capital connection charge and monthly service fees for water service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.	NA
Wastewater Service	Additional wastewater flows resulting from Alternative 1 in conjunction with other growth expected in the City would likely cause the existing treatment facility to operate at or above 80 percent of its design capacity, thus triggering the construction of the Phase II expansion of the Wastewater Treatment, Reclamation, and Recharge Facility (WTRRF). The City has agreed to supply wastewater treatment services	Additional wastewater flows resulting from Alternative 2 in conjunction with other growth expected in the City would likely cause the existing treatment facility to operate at or above 80 percent of its design capacity, thus triggering the construction of the Phase II expansion of the WTRRF. The City has agreed to supply wastewater treatment services pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With	Additional wastewater flows resulting from Alternative 3 in conjunction with other growth expected in the City would likely cause the existing treatment facility to operate at or above 80 percent of its design capacity, thus triggering the construction of the Phase II expansion of the WTRRF. The City has agreed to supply wastewater treatment services pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	<p>pursuant to the IGA between the City, Spokane County, and the Tribe. With implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public sewer and wastewater treatment system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 1. - LS</p> <p>In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current sewer capital connection charge and monthly service fees for sewer service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.</p>	<p>implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public sewer and wastewater treatment system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 2. - LS</p> <p>In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current sewer capital connection charge and monthly service fees for sewer service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.</p>	<p>implementation of the conditions of the IGA, no significant effects to the City's public sewer and wastewater treatment system and level of service would occur as a result of Alternative 3. - LS</p> <p>In accordance with the IGA, the Tribe shall pay the current sewer capital connection charge and monthly service fees for sewer service as established by City Council Resolution and Ordinance.</p>	NA
Solid Waste Service	<p>The Tribe will contract with Sunshine Disposal and Recycling, Inc (Sunshine Disposal) for solid waste collection service. The Spokane Regional Solid Waste System (SRSWS) transfer stations and disposal facilities have the capacity to serve Alternative 1; therefore, the construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects on solid waste services. - LS</p>	<p>The Tribe will contract with Sunshine Disposal for solid waste collection service. The SRSWS transfer stations and disposal facilities have the capacity to serve Alternative 2; therefore, the construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects on solid waste services. - LS</p>	<p>The Tribe will contract with Sunshine Disposal for solid waste collection service. The SRSWS transfer stations and disposal facilities have the capacity to serve Alternative 3; therefore, the construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects on solid waste services. - LS</p>	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Law Enforcement	<p>The Airway Heights Police Department (AHPD) would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 1; however, the City would experience</p>	<p>The AHPD would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 2; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with</p>	<p>The AHPD would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 3; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with demand for additional</p>	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	<p>increased costs associated with demand for additional law enforcement services. With implementation of the conditions of the MOA and the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming, development of Alternative 1 would not result in significant effects on public law enforcement services. - LSM</p> <p>Payments by the Tribe intended to compensate the City for costs of increased services are given in the MOA. In addition, the Tribe shall provide on-site security and assist the City in law enforcement to the extent allowable under the law.</p>	<p>demand for additional law enforcement services. With implementation of the conditions of the MOA and the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming, development of Alternative 2 would not result in significant effects on public law enforcement services. - LSM</p> <p>Payments by the Tribe intended to compensate the City for costs of increased services are given in the MOA. In addition, the Tribe shall provide on-site security and assist the City in law enforcement to the extent allowable under the law.</p>	<p>law enforcement services. With implementation of an agreement between the Tribe and the City of Airway Heights for law enforcement services, development of Alternative 3 would not result in significant effects on law enforcement services. - LSM</p> <p>The Tribe shall enter into an agreement with the City to compensate for costs of increased services, similar to those listed within the MOA. In addition, the Tribe shall provide on-site security and assist the City in law enforcement to the extent allowable under the law.</p>	NA
Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services	<p>The Airway Heights Fire Department (AHFD) would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 1; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with additional fire protection and emergency medical services. With implementation of the conditions of the MOA, development of Alternative 1 would not result in significant effects on AHFD. The increase in traffic through Fire District 10 – West Plains District as a</p>	<p>The AHFD would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 2; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with additional fire protection and emergency medical services. With implementation of the conditions of the MOA, development of Alternative 2 would not result in significant effects on AHFD. The increase in traffic through Fire District 10 – West Plains District as a result of Alternative 1 could</p>	<p>The AHFD would not need any additional facilities or equipment to meet the increased need for services under Alternative 3; however, the City would experience increased costs associated with additional fire protection and emergency medical services. With implementation of an agreement between the Tribe and the City of Airway Heights for fire protection services, development of Alternative 3 would not result in significant effects on AHFD. The increase in traffic through Fire District 10 – West Plains District as a result</p>	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	<p>result of Alternative 1 could significantly increase District's call volume. The Tribe shall provide fair-share assistance to District 10 through the existing mechanism established within Section XIV, Public Health and Safety, of the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. - LSM</p> <p>Payments by the Tribe intended to compensate the City for costs of increased services are given in the MOA and the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. In addition, the Tribe shall have medical technicians on staff at the project site, provide emergency medical and fire training to all staff, and maintain standards no less stringent than City or County ordinances and Washington State Law addressing fire safety.</p>	<p>significantly increase District's call volume. The Tribe shall provide fair-share assistance to District 10 through the existing mechanism established within Section XIV, Public Health and Safety, of the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. - LSM</p> <p>Payments by the Tribe intended to compensate the City for costs of increased services are given in the MOA and the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. In addition, the Tribe shall have medical technicians on staff at the project site, provide emergency medical and fire training to all staff, and maintain standards no less stringent than City or County ordinances and Washington State Law addressing fire safety.</p>	<p>of Alternative 1 could significantly increase District's call volume. The Tribe shall provide fair-share assistance to District 10 through the existing mechanism established within Section XIV, Public Health and Safety, of the Tribal-State Compact for Class III Gaming. - LSM</p> <p>The Tribe shall enter into an agreement with the City of Airway Heights for fire protection services. In addition, the Tribe shall have medical technicians on staff at the project site, provide emergency medical and fire training to all staff, and maintain standards no less stringent than City or County ordinances and Washington State Law addressing fire safety.</p>	NA
Electricity and Natural Gas	<p>Inland Power and Light (Inland Power) and Avista Utilities have the capacity to provide the project site with electricity and natural gas services, respectively. The Tribe would be responsible for payment of any fees charged by Inland Power for services/electricity provided to the site. As Inland Power will directly charge the Tribe for services rendered, there will be no effect on existing rate payers. Alternative 1</p>	<p>Inland Power and Avista Utilities have the capacity to provide the project site with electricity and natural gas services, respectively. The Tribe would be responsible for payment of any fees charged by Inland Power for services/electricity provided to the site. As Inland Power will directly charge the Tribe for services rendered, there will be no effect on existing rate payers. Alternative 2 would not result in</p>	<p>Inland Power and Avista Utilities have the capacity to provide the project site with electricity and natural gas services, respectively. The Tribe would be responsible for payment of any fees charged by Inland Power for services/electricity provided to the site. As Inland Power will directly charge the Tribe for services rendered, there will be no effect on existing rate payers. Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse</p>	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	would not result in significant adverse effects on electricity or natural gas services. - NE NA	significant adverse effects on electricity or natural gas services. - NE NA	effects on electricity or natural gas services. - NE NA	NA
Noise				
Construction Noise (Traffic)	Alternative 1 construction traffic would result in a 1 dBA Leq increase in the existing ambient noise level in the vicinity of area roadways, which is not an audible increase. - LS	Alternative 2 construction trips would result in less than a 1 dBA Leq increase in the existing ambient noise level, and thus would not result in a significant adverse effect to ambient noise levels during any phase of construction. - LS	Alternative 3 construction trips would result in less than a 1 dBA Leq increase in the existing ambient noise level, and thus would not result in a significant adverse effect to ambient noise levels during any phase of construction. - LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Construction Noise (Stationary)	The maximum stationary construction noise level for Alternative 1 at the nearest sensitive noise receptor would be greater than the Federal Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) of 67 dBA Leq. - LSM	The maximum stationary construction noise level for Alternative 2 at the nearest sensitive noise receptor would be greater than the NAC of 67 dBA Leq, a potentially significant effect. - LSM	The maximum stationary construction noise level for Alternative 3 at the nearest sensitive noise receptor would be greater than the NAC of 67 dBA Leq, a potentially significant effect. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	The Tribe shall implement noise abatement BMPs listed in Section 5.2.10 , to minimize noise generated during construction.	The Tribe shall implement noise abatement BMPs listed in Section 5.2.10 (Mitigation Measure A-D), to minimize noise generated during construction.	The Tribe shall implement noise abatement BMPs listed in Section 5.2.10 , to minimize noise generated during construction.	
Construction Vibration	The predicted vibration levels from construction of Alternative 1 are below the significance threshold for structures at 25 feet and for annoyance of people at 100 feet and would not result in significant	The predicted vibration levels from construction of Alternative 2 are below the significance threshold for structures at 25 feet and for annoyance of people at 100 feet and would not result in significant	The predicted vibration levels from construction of Alternative 3 are below the significance threshold for structures at 25 feet and for annoyance of people at 100 feet and would not result in significant adverse	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	adverse effects. - LS NA	adverse effects. - LS NA	effects. - LS NA	NA
Operation Noise (Traffic)	Alternative 1 would increase traffic noise, but would not result in significant adverse effects associated with traffic noise levels. - LS	Alternative 2 would increase traffic noise, but would not result in significant adverse effects associated with traffic noise levels. - LS	Alternative 3 would increase traffic noise, but would not result in significant adverse effects associated with traffic noise levels. - LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Operation Noise (Stationary)	Alternative 1 would increase noise levels from heating, cooling, and ventilation systems; idling trucks; and parking lots. However, this would not exceed Federal NAC at nearby sensitive receptors. - LS	Alternative 2 would increase noise levels from heating, cooling, and ventilation systems; idling trucks; and parking lots. However, this would not exceed Federal NAC at nearby sensitive receptors. - LS	Alternative 3 would increase noise levels from heating, cooling, and ventilation systems; idling trucks; and parking lots. However, this would not exceed Federal NAC at nearby sensitive receptors. - LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Operation Vibration	Commercial and hotel uses do not include sources of perceptible vibration. Therefore, operation of Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with vibration. - NE	Commercial uses do not include sources of perceptible vibration. Therefore, operation of Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with vibration. - NE	Commercial and hotel uses do not include sources of perceptible vibration. Therefore, operation of Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse effects associated with vibration. - NE	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Compatibility with Aircraft Noise	The western half of the project site is located within a Military Influence Area (MIA) as defined by the Fairchild AFB, the boundaries of which were determined based on the primary areas of aircraft over flight and potential for exposure to noise and vibrations. Exposure of	The project site would not include the development of a hotel tower, thus aircraft noise would not significantly add to or affect the potential noise effects resulting from Alternative 2. - NE	The western half of the project site is located within a MIA as defined by the Fairchild AFB, the boundaries of which were determined based on the primary areas of aircraft over flight and potential for exposure to noise and vibrations. Exposure of hotel patrons to noise from aircraft could	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	<p>hotel patrons to noise from aircraft could create the potential for annoyance and nuisance complaints. - LSM</p> <p>The Tribe shall implement mitigation measures in Section 5.2.10 to ensure appropriate sound attenuation methods are utilized during construction of the hotel</p>	NA	<p>create the potential for annoyance and nuisance complaints. - LSM</p> <p>The Tribe shall implement mitigation measures in Section 5.2.10 to ensure appropriate sound attenuation methods are utilized during construction of the hotel</p>	NA
Hazardous Materials				
Construction (Existing Hazards)	Construction personnel could encounter contamination during earth moving activities that may pose a risk to human health and/or the environment. - LSM	Construction personnel could encounter contamination during earth moving activities that may pose a risk to human health and/or the environment. - LSM	Construction personnel could encounter contamination during earth moving activities that may pose a risk to human health and/or the environment. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	In the event contamination is encountered and determined to be hazardous, the Tribe shall consult with the Environmental Protection Agency and shall comply with all federal hazardous materials regulations in the removal and disposal of any contaminated soil or water.	In the event contamination is encountered and determined to be hazardous, the Tribe shall consult with the Environmental Protection Agency and shall comply with all federal hazardous materials regulations in the removal and disposal of any contaminated soil or water.	In the event contamination is encountered and determined to be hazardous, the Tribe shall consult with the Environmental Protection Agency and shall comply with all federal hazardous materials regulations in the removal and disposal of any contaminated soil or water.	NA
Construction	Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 1 could pose a risk to human health and/or the environment. - LSM	Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 2 could pose a risk to human health and/or the environment. - LSM	Hazardous materials used during construction of Alternative 3 could pose a risk to human health and/or the environment. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	Construction personnel shall follow the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.11 to prevent the release of hazardous materials used during construction	Construction personnel shall follow the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.11 to prevent the release of hazardous materials used during construction	Construction personnel shall follow the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.11 to prevent the release of hazardous materials used during construction	NA

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
	into the environment.	into the environment.	into the environment.	
Operation	Small quantities of hazardous materials would be stored, handled, and disposed of during operation of Alternative 1; however adherence to state, federal, and manufacturer's guidelines would prevent impacts from use of these materials to the public or the environment. – LS	Small quantities of hazardous materials would be stored, handled, and disposed of during operation of Alternative 2; however adherence to state, federal, and manufacturer's guidelines would prevent impacts from use of these materials to the public or the environment. – LS	Small quantities of hazardous materials would be stored, handled, and disposed of during operation of Alternative 3; however adherence to state, federal, and manufacturer's guidelines would prevent impacts from use of these materials to the public or the environment. – LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Aesthetics				
Construction	Aesthetic related impacts from construction of Alternative 1 would be temporary in nature and would not result in obstructed views of scenic resources. - LS	Aesthetic related impacts from construction of Alternative 2 would be temporary in nature and would not result in obstructed views of scenic resources. - LS	Aesthetic related impacts from construction of Alternative 3 would be temporary in nature and would not result in obstructed views of scenic resources. - LS	NE
Mitigation	NA	NA	NA	NA
Operation (Viewsheds)	Alternative 1 would conform with Spokane County standards for development adjacent to US-2, a designated aesthetic corridor. New development on the project site would significantly alter views. While the site-specific visual effects may be considered significant, the context of the project in relation to the larger landscape would be less than significant (additional development within a highly developed region). - LSM	Alternative 2 would conform with Spokane County standards for development adjacent to US-2, a designated aesthetic corridor. New development on the project site would significantly alter views. While the site-specific visual effects may be considered significant, the context of the project in relation to the larger landscape would be less than significant (additional development within a highly developed region).- LSM	Alternative 3 would conform with Spokane County standards for development adjacent to US-2, a designated aesthetic corridor. New development on the project site would significantly alter views. While the site-specific visual effects may be considered significant, the context of the project in relation to the larger landscape would be less than significant (additional development within a highly developed region).. - LSM	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	Screening features and natural elements will be integrated into the landscaping design of the alternatives to screen the view of the facilities from existing residences directly adjacent to the project site.	Screening features and natural elements will be integrated into the landscaping design of the alternatives to screen the view of the facilities from existing residences directly adjacent to the project site.	Screening features and natural elements will be integrated into the landscaping design of the alternatives to screen the view of the facilities from existing residences directly adjacent to the project site.	NA
Operation (Shadow, Light, and Glare)	Alternative 1 could produce shadow, light, and glare in the project vicinity. - LSM	Alternative 2 could produce shadow, light, and glare in the project vicinity. - LSM	Alternative 3 could produce shadow, light, and glare in the project vicinity. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	The Tribe shall implement the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.12 , including the use of shielded and downcast lighting to prevent glare off-site and the use of non-reflective low-glare glass.	The Tribe shall implement the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.12 , including the use of shielded and downcast lighting to prevent glare off-site and the use of non-reflective low-glare glass.	The Tribe shall implement the BMPs listed in Section 5.2.12 , including the use of shielded and downcast lighting to prevent glare off-site and the use of non-reflective low-glare glass.	NA
Indirect and Growth-Inducing Effects				
From Off-site Traffic Mitigation	No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of off-site traffic mitigation under Alternative 1. - LSM	No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of off-site traffic mitigation under Alternative 2. - LSM	No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of off-site traffic mitigation under Alternative 3. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	See mitigation listed above.	See mitigation listed above.	See mitigation listed above.	NA
From Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements.	No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of water and wastewater infrastructure improvements under Alternative 1. - LSM	No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of water and wastewater infrastructure improvements under Alternative 2. - LSM	No significant indirect effects to any resource area are expected to occur as a result of water and wastewater infrastructure improvements under Alternative 3. - LSM	NE
Mitigation	See mitigation listed above.	See mitigation listed above.	See mitigation listed above.	NA
Growth-Inducing Effects	The minimal amount of commercial growth that may be induced by	The minimal amount of commercial growth that may be induced by	The minimal amount of commercial growth that may be induced by	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	Alternative 1 is not expected to result in significant adverse environmental effects. - LS NA	Alternative 2 is not expected to result in significant adverse environmental effects. - LS NA	Alternative 3 is not expected to result in significant adverse environmental effects. - LS NA	NA
Cumulative Effects				
Geology and Soils	All other developments that disturb one acre or more must comply with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit, which requires BMPs be chosen and implemented to address water quality degradation by preventing erosion. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to geology or soils. - LSM	All other developments that disturb one acre or more must comply with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit, which requires BMPs be chosen and implemented to address water quality degradation by preventing erosion. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to geology or soils. - LSM	All other developments that disturb one acre or more must comply with the requirements of the NPDES Construction General Permit, which requires BMPs be chosen and implemented to address water quality degradation by preventing erosion. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to geology or soils. - LSM	NE
Water Resources	Alternative 1 would not contribute to non-point source pollution and would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to stormwater. The City is in the process of developing interim water supply sources and pursuing an Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Project to address the overdraft conditions and provide for future supplies. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects on	Alternative 2 would not contribute to non-point source pollution and would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to stormwater. The City is in the process of developing interim water supply sources and pursuing an ASR Project to address the overdraft conditions and provide for future supplies. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects on groundwater resources. - LSM	Alternative 3 would not contribute to non-point source pollution and would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to stormwater. The City is in the process of developing interim water supply sources and pursuing an ASR Project to address the overdraft conditions and provide for future supplies. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects on groundwater resources. - LSM	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Cultural Resources	Cultural resources are afforded substantial protection through federal and state regulations and county historic preservation guidance. Because Alternative 1 would not impact cultural resources, it would not contribute towards potential adverse cumulative effects. - LSM	Cultural resources are afforded substantial protection through federal and state regulations and county historic preservation guidance. Because Alternative 2 would not impact cultural resources, it would not contribute towards potential adverse cumulative effects. - LSM	Cultural resources are afforded substantial protection through federal and state regulations and county historic preservation guidance. Because Alternative 3 would not impact cultural resources, it would not contribute towards potential adverse cumulative effects. - LSM	NE
Socioeconomic Conditions	Planning documents for Spokane County and the City will continue to designate land uses and plan public services for anticipated growth in the region. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not contribute to significant adverse cumulative socioeconomic effects. - LSM	Planning documents for Spokane County and the City will continue to designate land uses and plan public services for anticipated growth in the region. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not contribute to significant adverse cumulative socioeconomic effects. - LSM	Planning documents for Spokane County and the City will continue to designate land uses and plan public services for anticipated growth in the region. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not contribute to significant adverse cumulative socioeconomic effects. - LSM	NE
Transportation	The increase in traffic generated by Alternative 1 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations in the cumulative year 2032 at the study intersections below, and the I-90 Medical Lake Interchange, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards. The addition and growth of traffic from a variety of developments including the Proposed Project will add traffic to the Medical Lake Interchange and further degrade the poorly operating traffic conditions. WSDOT is in the planning level stage of determining	The increase in traffic generated by Alternative 2 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations in the cumulative year 2032 at the study intersections below, and the I-90 Medical Lake Interchange, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards. The addition and growth of traffic from a variety of developments including the Proposed Project will add traffic to the Medical Lake Interchange and further degrade the poorly operating traffic conditions. WSDOT is in the planning level stage of determining	The increase in traffic generated by Alternative 3 would contribute to unacceptable traffic operations in the cumulative year 2032 at the study intersections below, and the I-90 Medical Lake Interchange, causing them to operate below acceptable LOS standards. The addition and growth of traffic from a variety of developments including the Proposed Project will add traffic to the Medical Lake Interchange and further degrade the poorly operating traffic conditions. WSDOT is in the planning level stage of determining and implementing the	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
Mitigation	<p>and implementing the appropriate improvement for the interchange to increase operating standards to acceptable conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hwy 2/Craig Road ▪ Hwy 2/Lundstrom Street ▪ Hwy 2/Lawson Street ▪ Hwy 2/Garfield Street ▪ Hwy 2/Hayford Road ▪ Craig Road/SR-902 ▪ Hwy 2/Fairchild AFB ▪ Craig Road/6th Avenue ▪ Hwy 2/Middle Driveway ▪ Hwy 2/North Driveway <p>- LSM</p> <p>The Tribe shall implement and pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (G) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 1.</p>	<p>and implementing the appropriate improvement for the interchange to increase operating standards to acceptable conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hwy 2/Craig Road ▪ Hwy 2/Lundstrom Street ▪ Hwy 2/Garfield Street ▪ Hwy 2/Hayford Road ▪ Craig Road/SR-902 ▪ Hwy 2/Middle Driveway <p>- LSM</p> <p>The Tribe shall implement and pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (H) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 2.</p>	<p>appropriate improvement for the interchange to increase operating standards to acceptable conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hwy 2/Craig Road ▪ Hwy 2/Lundstrom Street ▪ Hwy 2/Garfield Street ▪ Hwy 2/Hayford Road ▪ Craig Road/SR-902 ▪ Hwy 2/Middle Driveway <p>- LSM</p> <p>The Tribe shall implement and pay a fair share contribution to traffic improvements detailed in Section 5.2.7 (I) for intersections adversely affected by Alternative 3.</p>	NA
Land Use	<p>Development within the City and County will be consistent with applicable planning documents and policies, which prevent disorderly growth and incompatible land uses. Alternative 1 would not contribute to adverse cumulative land use effects.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would not convert designated agricultural land to urban uses, and thus would not contribute to adverse cumulative effects to agricultural lands. - LS</p>	<p>Development within the City and County will be consistent with applicable planning documents and policies, which prevent disorderly growth and incompatible land uses. Alternative 2 would not contribute to adverse cumulative land use effects.</p> <p>Alternative 2 would not convert designated agricultural land to urban uses, and thus would not contribute to adverse cumulative effects to agricultural lands. - LS</p>	<p>Development within the City and County will be consistent with applicable planning documents and policies, which prevent disorderly growth and incompatible land uses. Alternative 3 would not contribute to adverse cumulative land use effects.</p> <p>Alternative 3 would not convert designated agricultural land to urban uses, and thus would not contribute to adverse cumulative effects to agricultural lands. - LS</p>	NE
Public Services	Approved projects would be required	Approved projects would be required	Approved projects would be required	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect **LS** = Less than Significant Effect **LSM** = Less than Significant with Mitigation
S = Significant Adverse Effect **BE** = Beneficial Effect **NA** = Not Applicable

Resource	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	No Action
	to follow the local plans and policies regarding public services and would have to pay connection and monthly fees as appropriate. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with Public Services. - LSM	to follow the local plans and policies regarding public services and would have to pay connection and monthly fees as appropriate. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with Public Services. - LSM	to follow the local plans and policies regarding public services and would have to pay connection and monthly fees as appropriate. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with Public Services. - LSM	
Noise	In the cumulative year 2032, traffic volumes would increase, but would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to sensitive receptors. - LSM	In the cumulative year 2032, traffic volumes would increase, but would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to sensitive receptors. - LSM	In the cumulative year 2032, traffic volumes would increase, but would not result in significant adverse cumulative effects to sensitive receptors. - LSM	NE
Hazardous Materials	Approved projects would be required to follow applicable federal and state regulations concerning hazardous materials management through the NPDES permitting process. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with hazardous materials. - LSM	Approved projects would be required to follow applicable federal and state regulations concerning hazardous materials management through the NPDES permitting process. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with hazardous materials. - LSM	Approved projects would be required to follow applicable federal and state regulations concerning hazardous materials management through the NPDES permitting process. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with hazardous materials. - LSM	NE
Aesthetics	Approved projects would be required to comply with local policies related to design, landscaping, sign, and lighting ordinances. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 1 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with visual resources. - LSM	Approved projects would be required to comply with local policies related to design, landscaping, sign, and lighting ordinances. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 2 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with visual resources. - LSM	Approved projects would be required to comply with local policies related to design, landscaping, sign, and lighting ordinances. With the implementation of mitigation measures listed above, Alternative 3 would not result in cumulative adverse effects associated with visual resources. - LSM	NE

Note: **NE** = No Effect
S = Significant Adverse Effect

LS = Less than Significant Effect
BE = Beneficial Effect

LSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation
NA = Not Applicable